

REMARKS

This Application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action. Applicants appreciate the Examiner's consideration of the Application. In order to advance prosecution of this Application, Applicants have responded to each notation by the Examiner. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and favorable action in this case.

Section 112 Rejection

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1-3, 6-9, 12-15, and 18-23 under 35 U.S.C. § 112.

Applicants respectfully point out that the Specification supports the following of Claim 1:

generating a metric vector for each signal of the plurality of signals, each metric vector comprising a plurality of metric values generated for the each signal, the plurality of metric values comprising a first metric value and a second metric value; and

applying a function to each metric vector to generate a metric rating for each signal, the function weighting the first metric value more than the second metric value because the first metric value has a greater effect on signal importance than the second metric.

As an example, the Specification states:

Metric extractor 60 may organize the metrics for a signal in any suitable manner. For example, a metric vector $\mathbf{v}(x_1, \dots, x_p)$ that includes metric values x_i for the metrics may be generated for a signal.

(Application, p. 10, ll. 17-21.) As another example, the Specification states:

According to one embodiment, a metric rating y may be determined by applying a function f to the values x_1, \dots, x_p of the metric vector $\mathbf{v}(x_1, \dots, x_p)$ according to $f(x_1, \dots, x_p) = y$. Function f may be used to define the importance of a signal to a call. For example, function f may be used to weight the metrics in accordance to their effect on measuring importance. A metric rating may, however, be determined in any suitable manner.

(Application, p. 10, ll. 24-32.)

The information contained in the disclosure of an application must be sufficient to inform those skilled in the relevant art how to both make and use the claimed invention. MPEP § 2164. Detailed procedures for making and using the invention may not be necessary if the description of the invention itself is sufficient to permit those skilled in the art to make and use the invention. MPEP § 2164.

The above examples of the Specification clearly inform those skilled in the relevant art how to make and use the above elements of Claim 1. For at least this reason, independent Claim 1 and its dependent claims are allowable under 35 U.S.C. § 112. For analogous reasons, independent Claims 7, 13, 19, and 20 and their dependent claims are allowable under 35 U.S.C. § 112. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of Claims 1-3, 5-9, 11-15, 17-19, and 21-23.

CONCLUSION

Applicants have made an earnest attempt to place this case in condition for allowance. For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully request full allowance of all the pending claims.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would advance prosecution of this case in any way, the Examiner is invited to contact Keiko Ichiye, the Attorney for Applicants, at the Examiner's convenience at (214) 953-6494.

Although Applicants believe no fees are due, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 02-0384 of Baker Botts L.L.P.

Respectfully submitted,

BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.
Attorneys for Applicants



Keiko Ichiye
Reg. No. 45,460

Correspondence Address:
Customer Number: 05073

Date: April 1, 2008